arXiv:1608.08490v1 [q-fin.PM] 30 Aug 2016

Multi-period investment strategies under Cumulative Prospect Theory

Liurui Deng[1] **and Traian A. Pirvu**[2]
[1]College of Economics and Management, Hunan Normal University,
Changsha, 410081, China
purplerosed@yahoo.com
[2] Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University
1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4K1
tpirvu@math.mcmaster.ca

Abstract

In this article, inspired by Shi, et al. we investigate the optimal portfolio selection with one risk-free asset and one risky asset in a multiple period setting under cumulative prospect theory (CPT). Compared with their study, our novelty is that we consider probability distortions, and portfolio constraints. In doing numerical analysis, we test the sensitivity of the optimal CPT-investment strategies to different model parameters.

Key words and phrases: Cumulative Prospect Theory (CPT), multi-period CPT-investment strategy, CPT-investor, portfolio selection, probability distortions, Choquet integral

1 Introduction

Expected utility theory (EUT) has the underlying assumption that the decision-maker is rational and uniformly risk averse, by considering the objective probability rather than the subjective probability (see [16]). In reality, however, various decision makers' behavior deviates from the implications of expected utility. Substantial experimental and empirical evidence identify that expected utility theory is incompatible with human observed behavior. The abundant paradoxes lead to the development of a more realistic theory. One of them is prospect theory (PT) (see [22]). Later, PT extends to cumulated prospect theory (CPT) because CPT is consistent with the first-order stochastic dominance (see [23]).

Let us go over some of the literature on CPT. In a continuous-time setting [13] formulate a general behavioral portfolio selection model under Kahneman and Tversky's cumulative prospect theory. In a discrete-time setting [2] considers how a CPT investor chooses his/her optimal portfolio in a single period setting with one risky and one riskless asset. In the same vein [11] and [12] address and formulate the well-posedness of CPT criterion and investigate the case in which the reference point is

different from the risk-free return. The extension to a multi asset paradigm was done in [17] and [14]. To the best of our knowledge [21] was the first to consider the CPT allocation problem in a multi period framework.

In this paper, we study the optimal portfolio of a CPT investor. Inspired by [21] we focus on the allocation problem with one risk-free asset and one risky asset in the multiple periods setting and CPT risk criterion. Because [21] considers the benchmark to be constant, the optimal strategies are time consistent in their setting. Compared with [21] one of the contributions of the present article is to address time inconsistency of optimal strategies due to the time changing benchmark. A time changing benchmark is more rational than a constant benchmark according to the CPT-investors' psychology. In addition to the time changing benchmark, another highlight of our work is that we incorporate the probability distortions (they more accurately reflect the real psychology of the CPT-investors), and portfolio constraints.

The development of our theoretical model brings complicated calculation and sophisticated analysis. In particular, since we consider the time changing benchmark, we have to face the time inconsistency of optimal investment strategies. Due to this predicament we consider a special type of benchmark which renders optimal strategies time consistent. They are computed by backward induction (see e.g. [15] and [18] for similar techniques). Our main result is a recursive formula to characterize the optimal strategies.

The stochastic model we consider for the stock return is fairly general. One interesting feature of our recursive formulas characterizing the optimal strategies is that they work for any distribution specification of stock returns. This is explained by the fact that optimal strategies are computed by backward induction. Our numerical experiments reveal the effect of time on the optimal strategies (this effect can not be observed in one period models). The main finding in this regard is that as time goes by the effect of the model parameters on optimal strategies diminishes.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we present the model. Section 3 provides the objective. The results are presented in Section 4. Numerical analysis is performed in Section 5. The paper ends with an Appendix containing the proofs.

2 The Model

We consider a financial market in which one can invest in one risk-free asset and one risky asset. The investment horizon is $[0, T]$, where T is a finite deterministic positive constant. Let t denote the time of investment which takes on discrete values $(t = 0, 1, ..., T-1)$. Moreover let r_t denote the return of the risk-free asset from the time t to the time $t+1$, and let x_t denote the return of the risky asset from the time t to the time $t+1$. We assume that an investor has wealth W_t at the time t and invests the amount v_t in the risky asset and all of remaining wealth $W_t - v_t$ in the risk-free asset. The investor's wealth W_{t+1} at time $t+1$ is given by the self-financiang

equation

$$\begin{aligned} W_{t+1} &= (1+r_t)(W_t - v_t) + (1+x_t)v_t \\ &= (1+r_t)W_t + (x_t - r_t)v_t \\ &= (1+r_t)W_t + y_t v_t. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Here y_t is a random variable and represents the excess return on the risky asset over the risk-free asset from the time t to the time $t+1$. The excess return process $\{y_t\}_{\{t=0,1,...,T-1\}}$ is an adapted stochastic process defined over the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{F}, P)$. The information set at the beginning of period t is $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(y_0, y_1, ..., y_{t-1})$. Moreover $y_t \in \mathcal{F}_{t+1}$.

2.1 The Benchmarked Wealth

Let $R_t^k = \prod_{j=t}^{k-1}(1+r_j)(0 \le t \le T-1, 1 \le k \le T)$, with $k \ge t$ be the value of 1 dollar (in the portfolio at time t) at time k. If the initial time is t, we let the benchmark be $R_t^k W_t$ at the time k (this is the amount at time k of W_t invested in the risk free asset at time t). The benchmarked wealth at time $t+1$, given initial time t is

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}_t^{t+1} &= R_t^{t+1} W_t + y_t v_t - R_t^{t+1} W_t \\ &= y_t v_t. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Given the initial time t the benchmarked wealth at time $t+2$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}_t^{t+2} &= R_{t+1}^{t+2} W_{t+1} + y_{t+1} v_{t+1} - R_t^{t+2} W_t \\ &= R_{t+1}^{t+2}(R_t^{t+1} W_t + y_t v_t) + y_{t+1} v_{t+1} - R_t^{t+2} W_t \\ &= R_{t+1}^{t+2} y_t v_t + y_{t+1} v_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

In general, the benchmarked wealth is given by the following Proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *If the initial time is t ($t = 0, 1, 2, ..., T-1$), then the benchmarked wealth at T is:*

$$\overline{W}_t^T = R_{t+1}^T v_t y_t + R_{t+2}^T v_{t+1} y_{t+1} + ... + R_{T-1}^T v_{T-2} y_{T-2} + v_{T-1} y_{T-1}. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. The proof is in Appendix A. □

This kind of benchmarking leads to time inconsistent behaviour as outlined in Subsection 3.3. The resolution we propose is to consider benchmarking at time $T-1$ only. Thus, if the initial time is t ($t = 0, 1, 2, ..., T-1$), then the benchmarked wealth at T is:

$$\underline{W}_t^T = [v_{T-1} y_{T-1} | W_t]. \tag{2.5}$$

2.2 Portfolio Constraints

It is often the case that managers impose risk limits on the trading strategies. The risk control mechanism has two components: one internal (imposed by risk management departments) and one external (accredited regulatory institutions). Thus, it is only natural to consider portfolio constraints. In the following we introduce the class of admissible strategies.

Definition 2.1. The set of admissible strategies at time t is $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$,

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \{v_t \in \mathcal{F}_t | \quad A|W_t| \leq v_t \leq B|W_t|\}$$

for some constants $A \leq 0 < B$.

2.3 The CPT Risk Criterion

The investor gets utility from gains and disutility from the losses. The benchmark differentiate gains from losses. Let us introduce the following formal definitions.

Definition 2.2. (see [22] and [23]) The value function u is defined as follows:

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} u^+(x) & \text{if } x \geq 0 \ , \\ -u^-(-x) & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $u^+ : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+ \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ and $u^- : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+ \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ satisfy:
(i) $u(0) = u^+(0) = u^-(0) = 0$;
(ii)$u^+(+\infty) = u^-(+\infty) = +\infty$;
(iii)$u^+(x) = x^\alpha$, with$0 < \alpha < 1$ and $x \geq 0$;
(iv)$u^-(x) = \lambda x^\alpha$ with $\lambda > 1$, and $x \geq 0$.

Definition 2.3. Let $F_X(\cdot)$ be the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a random variable X. The probability distortions are denoted by T^+ and T^-. We define the two probability weight functions (distortions) $T^+ : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ and $T^- : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ as follows:

$$T^+(F_X(x)) = \frac{F_X^\gamma(x)}{(F_X^\gamma(x) + (1 - F_X(x))^\gamma)^{1/\gamma}}, \quad \text{with} \ \ 0.28 < \gamma < 1,$$
$$T^-(F_X(x)) = \frac{F_X^\delta(x)}{(F_X^\delta(x) + (1 - F_X(x))^\delta)^{1/\delta}}, \quad \text{with} \ \ 0.28 < \delta < 1.$$

Definition 2.4. Define the objective function of the CPT-investor, denoted by $U(W)$, as:

$$U(W) = \int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_W(x))du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_W(-x))du^-(x), \tag{2.6}$$

where W is the benchmarked wealth. $U(W)$ is a sum of two Choguet integrals (see [4] and [5]). It is well-defined when

$$\alpha < 2\min(\delta, \gamma)$$

From Definition 2.4 it follows that the objective function of the CPT-investor at the time t is follows as:

$$U(\overline{W}_t^T) = \int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{\overline{W}_t^T}(x))du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{\overline{W}_t^T}(-x))du^-(x). \tag{2.7}$$

As we show in Subsection 3.3 this risk criterion is time inconsistent, thus we propose the benchmarked wealth $\overline{W}_t^T$ and the objective function

$$U(\underline{W}_t^T) = \int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{\underline{W}_t^T}(x))du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{\underline{W}_t^T}(-x))du^-(x). \tag{2.8}$$

3 Objective

In this section we formulate the CPT investor objective.

3.1 Single Period Objective

The current time here is $T-1$.Recall that the benchmarked wealth at time T is

$$\overline{W}_{T-1}^T = y_{T-1}v_{T-1} = \underline{W}_{T-1}^T.$$

The CPT-investor objective is to solve the following portfolio problem

$$\begin{aligned}(P)\quad & \max_{v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-1}} U(\overline{W}_{T-1}^T(v_{T-1})) \\ = \quad & \max_{v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-1}} \Big[\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{\overline{W}_{T-1}^T}(x))du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{\overline{W}_{T-1}^T}(-x))du^-(x)\Big],\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

and to find the optimal portfolio v_{T-1}^*

$$\begin{aligned}v_{T-1}^* &= arg \max_{v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-1}} U(\overline{W}_{T-1}^T(v_{T-1})) \\ &= arg \max_{v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-1}} \Big[\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{\overline{W}_{T-1}^T}(x))du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{\overline{W}_{T-1}^T}(-x))du^-(x)\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

3.2 Multiple Periods Objective

In order to get a time consistent optimal strategies we work with the benchmarked wealth $\underline{W}_t^T$. The CPT-investor objective is to solve the following portfolio problem

$$\begin{aligned}(P)\\ &\max_{v_i\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_i,\, i=t,t+1,\dots T-1} U(\underline{W}_t^T(v_i))\\ =\quad &\max_{v_i\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_i,\, i=t,t+1,\dots T-1} \Big[\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1-F_{\underline{W}_t^T}(x))du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{\underline{W}_t^T}(-x))du^-(x)\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

3.3 Time Inconsistency

If the benchmarked wealth $\overline{W}_t^T$ is used then the optimal strategy is time inconsistent. That is the optimal strategy computed in the past is not implemented unless there is a commitment mechanism. Indeed, $v_{T-1}^* \neq \hat{v}_{T-1}$, where

$$v_{T-1}^* = arg \max_{v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-1}} U(\overline{W}_{T-1}^T(v_{T-1})),$$

and

$$(\hat{v}_{T-2}, \hat{v}_{T-1}) = arg \max_{v_{T-2}, v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-2}} U(\overline{W}_{T-2}^T(v_{T-2}, v_{T-1})).$$

4 Results

Our presentation starts with the single period case.

4.0.1 One Period Model Results

Proposition 4.1. *The portfolio optimization problem is transformed into*

$$\max_{v_{T-1}\in\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{T-1}} U(\overline{W}_{T-1}^T(v_{T-1})) = W_{T-1}^{\alpha} A_{T-1} I_{W_{T-1}\geq 0} - (-W_{T-1})^{\beta}\alpha B_{T-1} I_{W_{T-1}<0}, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$A_{T-1} = \max_{z\in[A,B]} g_{T-1}(z),$$

$$B_{T-1} = -\max_{z\in[-B,-A]} l_{T-1}(z),$$

$$g_{T-1}(z) = z^{\alpha} k(T-1) I_{z\in[0,B]} + (-z)^{\alpha} h(T-1) I_{z\in[A,0]}$$

$$l_{T-1}(z) = (-z)^{\alpha} k(T-1) I_{z\in[-B,0]} + z^{\alpha} h(T-1) I_{z\in[0,-A]}$$

$$k(T-1) = \int_0^{+\infty} T^{+}(1 - F_{y_{T-1}}(x)) du^{+}(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^{-}(F_{y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^{-}(x)$$

and

$$h_(T-1) = \int_0^{+\infty} T^{+}(1 - F_{-y_{T-1}}(x)) du^{+}(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^{-}(F_{-y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^{-}(x)$$

Proof. The proof is in Appendix B. □

Theorem 4.1. *The optimal CPT-investment strategy is*

$$v^*_{T-1} = \begin{cases} k^*_{T-1} W_{T-1} & \text{if } W_{T-1} \geq 0 \ , \\ \hat{k}^*_{T-1} W_{T-1} & \text{if } W_{T-1} < 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$k^*_{T-1} = arg \max_{z\in[A,B]} g_{T-1}(z), \qquad \hat{k}^*_{T-1} = arg \max_{z\in[-B,-A]} l_{T-1}(z).$$

Proof. The above conclusion can be derived from Proposition 4.1. □

4.0.2 Multiple Periods Model Results

Subsequently, we consider the optimal strategies in the multiple periods. When the initial time is $T-2$, we can establish the following result.

Proposition 4.2. *The maximum CPT value is given by recursively by*

$$\max_{v_{T-2}, v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}^T_{T-2}) \quad = \quad A_{T-2} W^{\alpha}_{T-2} I_{W_{T-2}\geq 0} - B_{T-2}(-W_{T-2})^{\alpha} I_{W_{T-2}<0}, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$A_{T-2} = \max_{z\in[A,B]} g_{T-2}(z),$$

$$B_{T-2} = - \max_{z\in[-B,-A]} l_{T-2}(z),$$

$$\begin{aligned} & g_{T-2}(z) = E[A_{T-1}(1 + r_{T-2} + y_{T-2} z)^{\alpha} I_{\{1+r_{T-2}+y_{T-2}z\geq 0\}} \\ - \quad & B_{T-1}(-1 - r_{T-2} - y_{T-2} z)^{\alpha} I_{\{1+r_{T-2}+y_{T-2}z<0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{T-2}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & l_{T-2}(z) = E[A_{T-1}(-1 - r_{T-2} - y_{T-2} z)^{\alpha} I_{\{1+r_{T-2}+y_{T-2}z<0\}} \\ - \quad & B_{T-1}(1 + r_{T-2} + y_{T-2} z)^{\alpha} I_{\{1+r_{T-2}+y_{T-2}z\geq 0\}} | \mathcal{F}_{T-2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is done in Appendix C. □

Similarly, we can obtain the following key Proposition and Theorem for multiple periods.

Proposition 4.3. *Given the initial time t, the optimal CPT value is given recursively by*

$$\max_{v_t, v_{t+1}, \ldots v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_t^T) \quad = \quad A_t W_t^\alpha I_{W_t \geq 0} - B_t(-W_t)^\alpha I_{W_t < 0}, \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$A_t = \max_{z \in [A,B]} g_t(z),$$

$$B_t = - \max_{z \in [-B,-A]} l_t(z),$$

$$\begin{aligned} & g_t(z) = E[A_{t+1}(1 + r_t + y_t z)^\alpha I_{\{1+r_t+y_t z \geq 0\}} \\ - \quad & B_{t+1}(-1 - r_t - y_t z)^\alpha I_{\{1+r_t+y_t z < 0\}} | \mathcal{F}_t] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & l_t(z) = E[A_{t+1}(-1 - r_t - y_t z)^\alpha I_{\{1+r_t+y_t z < 0\}} \\ - \quad & B_{t+1}(1 + r_t + y_t z)^\alpha I_{\{1+r_t+y_t z \geq 0\}} | \mathcal{F}_t]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove this in Appendix D. □

The following Theorem is our main result of the paper.

Theorem 4.2. *The optimal CPT-investment strategy $(v_0^*, v_1^*, ..., v_T^*)$ is given recursively for $t = T-1, T-2, \ldots, 0$ by*

$$v_t^* = \begin{cases} k_t^* W_t & \text{if } W_t \geq 0 \ , \\ \hat{k}_t^* W_t & \text{if } W_t < 0, \end{cases}$$

$$k_t^* = arg \max_{z \in [A,B]} g_t(z)$$

and

$$\hat{k}_t^* = arg \max_{z \in [-B,-A]} l_t(z).$$

Proof. The above conclusion can be induced from Proposition 4.3. □

5 Numerical Analysis

5.1 Numerical simulation

We suppose the excess return y_t satisfies a normal distribution $N(\mu, \sigma)$. The interest rate is set to follow a Ho and Lee model

$$r_t = 0.03 + 0.003\sqrt{t}Z, \qquad Z \sim N(0,1).$$

We will test the sensitivity of optimal solution for the different parameters, α, μ and δ. Moreover, we further summarily analyze how CPT-investors' psychology and the characteristics of the stock influence on the optimal CPT-investment strategies. When we test sensitivity, we set $W_0 = 0.8$ and discuss sensitivity of t-th period (t=0,1,...,10). We set $\lambda = 2.20, \delta = 0.69, A = -5, B = 5$. Besides, we let $\mu = 0.045, \sigma = 1.69$ in Figure 1 and let $\alpha = 0.88$ in Figure 2 and Figure 3. Firstly, in order to reveal the effect of CPT-investors' psychology on the optimal portfolio choice, we analyze the sensitivity of the optimal solution to the parameter α (see Figure 1). The ratio invested in the risky asset is increasing in α. Moreover it is slowly decreasing in time. As expected the investment in the risky asset is decreasing in σ and increasing in μ. Moreover it turns out to be slowly decreasing in time. It interesting to point out that a random interest rate forces a higher investment in the risky asset, fact explained by the risk incurred in investing in the risk free asset.

Figure 1: The sensitivity for the parameter α



Figure 1: The sensitivity for the parameter α



Figure 2: The sensitivity for the parameter σ



Figure 3: The sensitivity for the parameter μ



Figure 4: Pattern behaviour for different r



Figure 4: Pattern behaviour for different r



Acknowledgement The article is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (71201051), Young Talents Training Plan of Hunan Normal University(2014YX04), Philosophical and Social Science Fund of Hunan (No.14YBA264), and NSERC grant 396-5058-14.

6 Appendix

6.1 Appendix A: Proof of Proposition 2.1

Proof. We denote the benchmark at time T by $\overline{W}^T_{T-k}$, when the initial time is $T-k$. Now, by mathematical induction, we prove

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}^T_{T-k} &= R^T_{T-k+1} v_{T-k} y_{T-k} + R^T_{T-k+2} v_{T-k+1} y_{T-k+1} + ... \\ &+ R^T_{T-1} v_{T-2} y_{T-2} + v_{T-1} y_{T-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

When $k = 1$, then (2.2) indicates

$$\overline{W}^T_{T-1} = v_{T-1} y_{T-1}.$$

That is, (6.1) holds.

Moreover, when $k = 2$, with equation (2.3), one can show that

$$\overline{W}^T_{T-k} = R^T_{T-1} v_{T-2} y_{T-2} + v_{T-1} y_{T-1}. \tag{6.2}$$

We suppose when $k = N$, (6.1) holds. That is ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}^T_{T-N} &= R^T_{T-N+1} v_{T-N} y_{T-N} + R^T_{T-N+2} v_{T-N+1} y_{T-N+1} + ... \\ &+ R^T_{T-1} v_{T-2} y_{T-2} + v_{T-1} y_{T-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Now, we only need to prove that equation (6.1) holds, when $k = N + 1$. One can easily obtain

$$\overline{W}^T_{T-N-1} = R^T_{T-1} W_{T-1} + y_{T-1} v_{T-1} - R^T_{T-N-1} W_{T-N-1}$$

and

$$\overline{W}^T_{T-N} = R^T_{T-1} W_{T-1} + y_{T-1} v_{T-1} - R^T_{T-N} W_{T-N}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}^T_{T-N-1} &= R^T_{T-N} W_{T-N} - R^T_{T-N-1} W_{T-N-1} + \overline{W}^T_{T-N} \\ &= R^T_{T-N} (R^{T-N}_{T-N-1} W_{T-N-1} + v_{T-N-1} y_{T-N-1}) - R^T_{T-N-1} W_{T-N-1} + \overline{W}^T_{T-N} \\ &= R^T_{T-N} v_{T-N-1} y_{T-N-1} + \overline{W}^T_{T-N} \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Applying the above equation to equation (6.3), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{W}^T_{T-N-1} &= R^T_{T-N} v_{T-N-1} y_{T-N-1} + R^T_{T-N+1} v_{T-N} y_{T-N} + ... \\ &+ R^T_{T-1} v_{T-2} y_{T-2} + v_{T-1} y_{T-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Hence, (6.1) holds. Next, set $k = T - t$ to obtain

$$\overline{W}^T_t = R^T_{t+1} v_t y_t + R^T_{t+2} v_{t+1} y_{t+1} + ... + v_{T-1} y_{T-1}. \tag{6.6}$$

□

6.2 Appendix B: proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof. When $W_{T-1} \geq 0$ and $0 \leq v_{T-1} \leq B W_{T-1}$, we directly employ the result of [2] in order to get

$$\begin{aligned} & U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) \\ = \; & v^\alpha_{T-1} \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big). \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Let $v_{T-1} = W_{T-1}z$.
So,

$$\begin{aligned} & U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) \\ = \; & W^\alpha_{T-1} z^\alpha \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big). \\ = \; & W^\alpha_{T-1} z^\alpha k(T-1) \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

Similarly, when $W_{T-1} \geq 0$ and $AW_{T-1} \leq v_{T-1} \leq 0$, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} & U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) \\ = \; & (-v_{T-1})^\alpha \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{-y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{-y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big) \\ = \; & W^\alpha_{T-1}(-z)^\alpha \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{-y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{-y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big) \\ = \; & W^\alpha_{T-1}(-z)^\alpha h(T-1). \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Hence, when $W_{T-1} \geq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) &= W^\alpha_{T-1}[z^\alpha k(T-1) I_{z\in[0,B]} + (-z)^\alpha h(T-1) I_{z\in[A,0]}] \\ &= W^\alpha_{T-1} g_{T-1}(z). \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

When $W_{T-1} < 0$ and $0 \leq v_{T-1} \leq -BW_{T-1}$, one easily gets

$$\begin{aligned} & U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) \\ = \; & (-W_{T-1})^\alpha (-z)^\alpha \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big) \\ = \; & (-W_{T-1})^\alpha (-z)^\alpha k(T-1) \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

When $W_{T-1} < 0$ and $-AW_{T-1} \leq v_{T-1} \leq 0$, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} & U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) \\ = \; & (-v_{T-1})^\alpha \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{-y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{-y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big) \\ = \; & (-W_{T-1})^\alpha z^\alpha \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} T^+(1 - F_{-y_{T-1}}(x)) du^+(x) - \int_0^{+\infty} T^-(F_{-y_{T-1}}(-x)) du^-(x) \Big) \\ = \; & (-W_{T-1})^\alpha z^\alpha h(T-1). \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Therefore, when $W_{T-1} < 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} U(\overline{W}^T_{T-1}(v_{T-1})) &= (-W_{T-1})^\alpha [(-z)^\alpha k(T-1) I_{z\in[-B,0]} + z^\alpha h(T-1) I_{z\in[0,-A]}] \\ &= (-W_{T-1})^\alpha l_{T-1}(z). \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

□

6.3 Appendix C: proof of Proposition 4.2

Proof. Since $\underline{W}_t^T = [v_{T-1}y_{T-1}|W_t]$, iterated conditioning gets

$$\max_{v_{T-2},v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{T-2}^T) = \max_{v_{T-2}} E[\max_{v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{T-1}^T)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}].$$

Applying Proposition 4.1 to the above equation, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v_{T-2},v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{T-2}^T) \\ = \ & \max_{v_{T-2}} E[W_{T-1}^{\alpha} A_{T-1} I_{W_{T-1}\geq 0} - (-W_{T-1})^{\alpha} B_{T-1} I_{W_{T-1}<0}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

From equation (2.1) one can get that

$$W_{T-1} = (1 + r_{T-2})W_{T-2} + v_{T-2}y_{T-2}.$$

Let

$$v_{T-2} = W_{T-2}k_{T-2}.$$

When $W_{T-2} \geq 0$, it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v_{T-2},v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{T-2}^T) \\ = \ & W_{T-2}^{\alpha} \max_{k_{T-2}\in[A,B]} E[(1 + r_{T-2} + k_{T-2}y_{T-2})^{\alpha} A_{T-1} I_{1+r_{T-2}+k_{T-2}y_{T-2}\geq 0} \\ - \ & (-1 - r_{T-2} - k_{T-2}y_{T-2})^{\alpha} B_{T-1} I_{1+r_{T-2}+k_{T-2}y_{T-2}<0}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}] \\ = \ & W_{T-2}^{\alpha} \max_{k_{T-2}\in[A,B]} g_{T-2}(k_{T-2}) \\ = \ & W_{T-2}^{\alpha} A_{T-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

When $W_{T-2} < 0$, similarly, we confirm that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v_{T-2},v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{T-2}^T) \\ = \ & (-W_{T-2})^{\alpha} \max_{\hat{k}_{T-2}\in[-B,-A]} E[(-1 - r_{T-2} - \hat{k}_{T-2}y_{T-2})^{\alpha} A_{T-1} I_{1+r_{T-2}+\hat{k}_{T-2}y_{T-2}<0} \\ - \ & (1 + r_{T-2} + \hat{k}_{T-2}y_{T-2})^{\alpha} B_{T-1} I_{1+r_{T-2}+\hat{k}_{T-2}y_{T-2}\geq 0}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}] \\ = \ & (-W_{T-2})^{\alpha} \max_{\hat{k}_{T-2}\in[-B,-A]} l_{T-2}(\hat{k}_{T-2}) \\ = \ & -(-W_{T-2})^{\alpha} B_{T-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

Therefore, Propsition 4.2 holds. □

6.4 Appendix D: proof of Proposition 4.3

Proof. We use mathematical induction to prove this proposition. Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 display that the conclusion of Proposition 4.3 holds at the time T-1 and T-2. We suppose the conclusion holds at the time $t+1$. Namely,

$$\max_{v_{t+1},v_{t+2},\ldots v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{t+1}^T) = A_{t+1}W_{t+1}^{\alpha} I_{W_{t+1}\geq 0} - B_{t+1}(-W_{t+1})^{\alpha} I_{W_{t+1}<0}. \quad (6.17)$$

Since $\underline{W}_t^T = [v_{T-1}y_{T-1}|W_t]$, iterated conditioning gets

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v_t,v_{t+1},\ldots v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_t^T) \\ = & \max_{v_t} E_t[\max_{v_{t+1},v_{t+2},\ldots v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_{t+1}^T)] \\ = & \max_{v_t} E[A_{t+1}W_{t+1}^{\alpha} I_{W_{t+1}\geq 0} - B_{t+1}(-W_{t+1})^{\alpha} I_{W_{t+1}<0}\Big|\mathcal{F}_t]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

Let

$$v_t = W_t k_t.$$

Since

$$W_{t+1} = (1+r_t)W_t + v_t y_t,$$

we have

$$W_{t+1} = W_t(1 + r_t + k_t y_t).$$

Therefore, when $W_t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v_t,v_{t+1},\ldots v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_t^T) \\ = & W_t^{\alpha} \max_{k_t\in[A,B]} E[(1+r_t+k_t y_t)^{\alpha} A_{t+1} I_{1+r_t+k_t y_t\geq 0} \\ - & (-1-r_t-k_t y_t)^{\alpha} B_{t+1} I_{1+r_t+k_t y_t<0}\Big|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ = & W_t^{\alpha} \max_{k_t\in[A,B]} g_t(k_t) \\ = & W_t^{\alpha} A_t. \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

When $W_t < 0$, we can similarly find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v_t,v_{t+1},\ldots v_{T-1}} U(\underline{W}_t^T) \\ = & (-W_t)^{\alpha} \max_{\hat{k}_t\in[-B,-A]} E[(-1-r_t-\hat{k}_t y_t)^{\alpha} A_{t+1} I_{1+r_t+\hat{k}_t y_t<0} \\ - & (1+r_t+\hat{k}_{t2} y_t)^{\alpha} B_{t+1} I_{1+r_t+\hat{k}_t y_t\geq 0}\Big|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ = & (-W_t)^{\alpha} \max_{\hat{k}_t\in[-B,-A]} l_t(\hat{k}_t) \\ = & -(-W_t)^{\alpha} B_t. \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

Thus, Proposition 4.3 holds. □

References

[1] L. F. Ackert and R. Deaves, Behavioral finance: psychology, decision-making, and markets, *Cengage Learning*, 2013.

[2] C. Bernard and M. Ghossoub, Static Portfolio Choice under Cumulative Prospect Theory, *Mathematics and financial economics*, 2010, 2 (4), 277-306.

[3] C. Bernard, X. He, J. Yand and X. Zhou, Optimal Insurance Design under Rank Dependent Utility, 2015, to appear in *Mathematical Finance*.

[4] G. Choquet, Theory of capacities, *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 1953, 5, 131-295.

[5] A. Chateauneuf, R. A. Dana, and J. Tallon, Optimal risk-sharing rules and equilibria with Choquet-expected-utility, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 2000, 34(2),191-214.

[6] G. Carlier and R.-A. Dana, Existence and Monotonicity of Solutions to Moral Hazard Problems, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 2005, 41, 826-843.

[7] G. Carlier and R.-A. Dana, Rearrangement Inequalities in Non-Convex Insurance Models, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 2005, 41, 483-503.

[8] G. Carlier and R.-A. Dana, Two-persons efficient risk-sharing and equilibria for concave law-invariant utilities, *Economic Theory*, 2008, 36(2), 189-223.

[9] G. Carlier and R.-A. Dana, Optimal demand for contingent claims when agents have law-invariant utilities, *Mathematical Finance*, 2011, 21(2), 169-201.

[10] R.-A. Dana and M. Scarsini, Optimal Risk Sharing with Background Risk, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2007, 133(1), 152-176.

[11] X. He, and X. Zhou, Portfolio Choice under Cumulative Prospect Theory: An Analytical Treatment, *Management Science*, 2011, 57(2), 315-331.

[12] X. He, and X. Zhou,, Portfolio Choice via Quantiles, *Mathematical Finance*, 2011, 21(2), 203-231.

[13] H. Jin and X. Zhou,, Behavioral portfolio selection in continuous time, Mathematical Finance, 2008, 18(3), 385-426.

[14] M. Kwak and T. A. Pirvu, Cumulative Prospect Theory with Skewed Return Distribution, *Social Science Research Network*, 2015.

[15] M. Kwak, T. A. Pirvu and H. Zhang, A multiperiod equilibrium pricing model, *Journal of Applied Mathematics* ,2014, Aricle ID 408685, 1-14.

[16] J. Neummann and O. Morgenstern, Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour, *Princeton University Press*,1944.

[17] T. A. Pirvu and K. Schulze, Multi-stock portfolio optimization under prospect theory, *Mathematics and financial economics*, 2012, 6, 337-362.

[18] T. A. Pirvu and H. Zhang, Utility indifference pricing: A time consistent approach, *Applied mathematical finance*, 2013, 20 (4), 304-326.

[19] J. Quiggin, Comparative statics for Rank-Dependent Expected Utility Theory, *Journal of Risk and uncertainty*,1991, 4, 339-350.

[20] D. Schmeidler, Subjective probability and expected utility without additivity, *Econometrica*, 1989, 57(3), 571-587.

[21] Y. Shi, X. Cui and D. Li, Discrete-time behavioural portfolio selection under prospect theory, *Social Science Research Network*, 2014.

[22] A.Tversky and D. Kahneman, Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under rick, *Econometrica* 1992, 47, 262-291.

[23] A.Tversky and D. Kahneman, Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty, *Journal of Risk and uncertainty*, 1992, 5, 297-323.

[24] M. E. Yaari, The dual theory of choice under risk, *Econometrica*, 1987, 55(1), 95-115.